



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

snow, in brush piles, in grass, or even in cavities in the rocks. I have found juncos and song sparrows, at twilight, snugly hidden in corn shocks, in hay stacks, and in barns, either burrowing in the hay or perched on timbers. Field birds pretty generally agree in sleeping under the grass when they can, under the snow when it is deep enough to furnish good cover. Every hunter is familiar with the little holes made in soft snowdrifts by prairie chickens that have gone to rest. Horned larks, snowflakes, longspurs, and even meadow larks do the same, only with less evidence, because they are smaller. One is fully repaid for his effort to tramp over the snow-covered fields in the early morning twilight by the sudden popping of a snow kernel at his feet into a startled sleepy bird, darting off a few rods, and again plunging head-foremost into the soft snow to finish his nap. Bob-white has solved the problem of the best rest coupled with the best protection. The leader first selects the bivouac, treading the ground over carefully to make sure of its suitability. He is soon joined by others who slide up, with their heads pointing the same way. Others rapidly join themselves to this nucleus, all tails touching in the center of the circle now formed. Three hungry or careless birds stand without the complete circle, but two of them manage to wriggle themselves into position. The last one tries here and there without success. But to be left out means probable death. He lightly jumps upon the backs of his mates, closely examines the whole circle, settles himself between two birds and wriggles to the ground safe.

---

## THE SCHOOL CITY<sup>1</sup>

---

C. W. FRENCH

Hyde Park High School, Chicago

---

The school-city idea, as such, is probably an offshoot of the older idea of student participation in school government, which originated about the beginning of the sixteenth century in Germany, and which has found expression in various forms in the great endowed schools of England and the colleges of America, and in recent years in numbers of the lower schools of the United States and Canada.

<sup>1</sup> Read at the conference of the Departments of History and Political Science.

The school-city originated in New York city, although wholly independent experiments in this direction were inaugurated in other places at practically the same time. For a few years the forms of organization prescribed by the originators were widely copied, in general with but indifferent success, until the whole movement seemed to fall into disrepute and was dropped by one school after another until it became almost extinct. Within the last few months, it has seemed to be on the verge of a renaissance, whether because of its own inherent vitality and persistence, or of the renewed interest of some of its advocates, as illustrated by a recent series of articles in *Education* by Superintendent Tucker, of Sturgis, S. D.

It is my purpose, first, to give some reasons for this apparent decline and second, to inquire briefly into its original purposes and motives.

In the first place, it must be said that the movement has never passed beyond the experimental stage. Its most ardent advocates have never claimed that it has developed into a well-defined system or even that it has approached in any degree such definition and crystallization. The most that can be said for it is that the demand for some such movement in our modern education was clear, that its methods were in harmony with the latest developments of pedagogical thought, and that its partial results were such as apparently to justify its right to exist and to give a reasonable assurance that the experiment, if rightly conducted and patiently worked out, would eventuate in success.

To the careful observer its apparent failure is due to a number of causes external to itself, and not in any degree affecting its integrity.

From the beginning it has been unfortunate in its name; "pupil-government" and "self-government." Both indicate an abandonment of the teacher's authority and the substitution of a sort of government by the pupils which would limit the function of the teacher simply to the conduct of recitations under rules prescribed by the classes; and it has been difficult to disabuse the minds of probably a great majority of American teachers of this very erroneous conception. The name "school city" is not much better, for, while it is not absolutely misleading, it is, at its best, awkward and uncouth, and fails adequately to define the movement in the fulness of its purpose and scope.

It would be well if some genius could invent or discover a name which would be fairly definitive and still not carry with it unwarranted implications. The most satisfactory name I have seen is "student co-operation," and even this fails to meet the necessity.

Perhaps the most apparent cause of its partial failure is to be found in the haste with which it has been adopted without a proper conception of its meaning. Numerous teachers, caught by its novelty or impressed by the enthusiasm of its advocates, with but a vague idea of the course to be sailed or the point to be reached, embarked recklessly upon the new craft and suffered shipwreck upon the stormy seas or the rocky coasts, or, becoming daunted by the threats of storm, abandoned the ship and declared it unseaworthy. In hundreds of cases, many of which have come within my own notice, teachers and school officers eagerly adopted the idea without any serious study or investigation on their own part or preparation on the part of their pupils, and when failure came, as it was certain to come, they condemned the movement as impracticable and failed to see that they had not given it a fair trial.

In any departure, so radical as this, it is not safe to take the deductions of others, but each teacher must carefully study and investigate the question in all its bearings, and then seek to adapt it to his own school; and then only after he has laid the foundations with the utmost care, can he proceed to build the structure slowly, and with circumspection, feeling his way step by step. More than in any other way has this movement suffered from the ignorance and undue haste of its converts.

Another reason for its failure is found in the tendency to eliminate the authority of the teacher, either wholly or in part. If there is one danger, greater than others, which assails our public schools, it is the lack of recognition of authority on the part of the pupils. Obedience is more than a virtue; it is an absolute essential to the successful conduct of our schools; and if it is not insisted on, the fundamental purpose of the public-school system will be thwarted, and the doors thrown wide open to evil influences, which will wreck our splendid civilization, even as they wrecked Rome in the days of her greatest pride. Any system that tends to weaken the authority of the teacher should be instantly abandoned, and it will find no advocate among

thinking men and women. In the minds of its originators, this system implied no such abandonment of authority, but simply sought to transmute a forced or unreasoning obedience into an obedience which should be voluntary and rational. There was no thought of opening the door to license and anarchy, yet not a few teachers announced to their schools that they would abandon their authority and hand it over to the school, and it was hard to convince the public, which is generally right-minded when the welfare of the schools is concerned, that this movement, if adopted, would not overthrow all authority in the schools.

In some cases the movement tended to degenerate into a mere system of monitorial espionage. Any agency which sets one pupil to spy upon another, and then to report his misdeeds to the teacher, is wholly and deservedly obnoxious to the spirit of American citizenship. If this were nothing but a system of monitors, it would merit little but contempt at the hands of teachers and patrons; and when it was so interpreted, a grievous mistake was made, as I shall try presently to show.

The last cause of its apparent failure which I shall mention is the entire inability of most teachers to grasp the full extent and meaning of the movement. Most of those who adopted it believed it to be only a method of government, a device which would relieve the teacher of the troublesome problem of preserving order, and would in some magic way secure order automatically and discipline without effort. This was the most fatal misconception of all, and it is the one that persists today, even in the minds of many of its prominent advocates.

It seems that its wonderful possibilities have been largely obscured and that its breadth and scope have been belittled. For even the feeble and spasmodic efforts that have been exacted to shed light upon this problem have been sufficient to reveal it as one of the greatest in its possibilities and promises in recent educational history. This miscalled and misunderstood, often execrated, oftener ridiculed, movement, is not a ready-made device for governing a school. It is, instead, an educational process, a conception, which involves both the intellectual and ethical, and makes possible the realization of that philosophical doctrine, enunciated by Dr. Dewey: "Education is life."

Such, in very brief, are some of the causes of the greatly decreased interest now observable in the self-government idea. I desire now to inquire for a moment into the real meaning and the possibilities of the movement.

It is known to all that educational practice has undergone a great revolution during the past fifteen years. The course of study has been made both more extensive and more intensive. The textbook has largely given place to the library, the laboratory, and the workshop. Instead of being presented with knowledge predigested and diluted to meet the needs of the weakest mind, the student has been taught to hunt up the raw material for himself and to prepare it for his own use. A wider field of research has been thrown open to him and greater possibilities have been placed within his reach. Science, mathematics, history, literature, language, the concrete and the abstract, the practical and the theoretical, have all been presented more simply and rationally. Where once the boy and girl were taught to use their brains only, they are now also taught to use their hands, and many of the useful arts have made their way into the schoolroom, bringing a new vigor and life-connection into the educational system.

But with all this broadening out there is one department of education which has been overlooked. The intellectual and the physical have been given due attention, but the social, or what may in the last analysis be called the ethical, has been largely neglected.

In a democracy, more than in any other form of political organization the school is essential to the integrity of the government. An ignorant people is not capable of wise self-government. Schools must exist and perform their proper function, or freedom must give place to tyranny. Moreover, some departments of education are more vital to such a political system than others. It is more essential that an American citizen, as such, should know the theory and practice of democratic government than that he should know Latin and Greek. It is more important that he learn to direct his life according to the principles of right, justice, and purity, than that he win glorious (!) victories on the gridiron; that he should understand and be true to his obligations to his fellow-men, than that he should acquire proficiency as an artist or a craftsman. Is it not true that these

are the things which the country is today imperiously demanding of its schools, and not the others, important as they may be?

I have yet to see the course of study of any school which contains the slightest recognition of this supreme obligation. But, you say, this is so elusive a thing, it concerns itself so intimately with the emotional and moral natures, which cannot be molded specifically by courses of study, or trained by set instruction, that it is impossible to recognize it in the organization of the school or in the arrangement of the curriculum.

It is a familiar cry that morals cannot be taught from textbooks, and he would be a bold man and a heretic who would venture to deny it. But does it follow that morals cannot be taught specifically, and as such? Wood-working cannot be taught satisfactorily from books, but it can be taught specifically, definitely, and practically at the bench, and we are doing it daily in our schools.

You say we are teaching morals by our examples, that every lesson taught is a moral conquest, and that we do not need to do more. Is it not about time that we disabuse ourselves of this most dangerous delusion, and confess that we are failing, woefully failing, all along the line; that we are not teaching our pupils their duties to their government, their fellow-men, and their God? And when all is said, ought we not to have done this, even if we had to leave the other undone?

This is the ideal that the originators of the student-government movement, at least some of them, have set before themselves. They have not attained it. Too many of their efforts have resulted in abject failure, but I think they are not yet ready to give up; and in the end someone, somewhere, will solve the problem, and the American school will become rounded out and complete.

Perhaps it is necessary to present this idea, somewhat more in detail.

The school city, as I knew it, was never thought to be an end but only a means, and intrinsically a very unimportant means, toward the great end. What, then, did it seek to accomplish? Three things:

1. A fair working knowledge of practical politics: the political organizations of city, state, and nation; the duties of officers—execu-

tive, legislative, and judicial; the method of conducting political conventions, primaries, and elections. All of it concrete, practical, useful—a workshop, a laboratory of politics.

2. An appreciation of the obligations entailed upon the individual by the fact of his being a member of society; the negative aspect that he has no right to do anything, that will bring injury or unhappiness to his neighbor, and the positive, that it is his duty to do all he can to promote the common welfare, no matter at what cost of labor and self-sacrifice; that it is his duty to vote, to use his influence to secure public cleanliness, and correct sanitation, to see that the streets are paved, that intemperance, crime, and vice of all kinds are limited, discouraged, and, so far as possible, eliminated; in fact, to be a good citizen to the farthest limit of its meaning.

3. Personal righteousness: the acquisition of the ability to discriminate between right and wrong, and the purpose to choose the right; the formation of those habits which lead to personal integrity and upright thinking; and, in its final outcome, the enthronement of God in the heart and the firm determination to do his will.

Thus self-government becomes synonymous with divine government, and nothing less than this does it seek to realize. To this end the school-city has proved to be but a feeble instrumentality, and when a better is devised it will be gladly surrendered. That there is a better is sure; that it has not yet been found is equally sure. Meantime shall we not make the best possible use of that which has produced some results in this direction, while we are constantly and earnestly seeking a better?

Someone asks: "What has the school city accomplished?" My experience and observation convince me that it has accomplished at least these results:

1. A fair working knowledge of the political organization of a municipality, together with the more obvious duties and responsibilities of its chief officers; and I venture to say that this knowledge is more accurate and practical than any class has ever secured from mere textbook study alone. It is by observation and practice that this knowledge must be attained; and I think this may be recognized as the cause of the rapid and significant decline of the set teaching of civics in the public high school. In a recent report of the Bureau



of Education this decline is strikingly shown. In 1898, 22.74 per cent. of the total high-school enrolment was reported as studying civics. In 1899 the number fell to 21.97 per cent.; in 1900, to 21.66 per cent.; and in 1901, to 20.97 per cent. Within the past three years the decline has been more rapid. In 1901 in the high schools of the fifty largest cities 9,495 pupils (7.95 per cent.) were studying civics, while 20,000 were studying French. In the city of New York out of 8,000 pupils enrolled in the high schools 400 were studying civics; in St. Louis, 38 out of 2,500. Unquestionably the teaching of textbook civics is a failure, and even if it were not, it reaches but a small fraction of the enrolment, while by the laboratory method all the pupils in the school may be effectively taught.

2. A rectified and invigorated public sentiment. The right-minded majority takes the place of the evil-minded or mischievous minority as the controlling factor in school life. Much of the disorder and lawlessness that have vexed the hearts of teachers in the past have resulted from the willingness of this majority to be imposed upon. When they come to recognize clearly their rights, they will not so easily suffer themselves to be deprived of them. The mischievous boy soon finds himself without an audience, and in nine cases out of ten this removes the motive for his antics. It is possible that in this very fact may be found the true key to the solution of the difficult problem of government in the school, as it certainly does in the community. A vigorous and healthy public sentiment in school has been a hard thing to secure, but when it is once attained, it will make the burden of the teacher much easier to carry.

3. A more sympathetic and intimate relationship between teacher and pupil. The too common feeling that it is the duty of the teacher to suppress or repress the pupil, and of the pupil to outwit the teacher, cannot survive in this atmosphere, and the normal relations come spontaneously into existence. In my own experience, this was probably the most striking result attained, and I think that it alone would sufficiently justify the movement.

4. An increased sense of individual responsibility for the welfare of the school, a higher standard of student honor, an abatement of boisterousness, and an increase of courtesy and considerateness may all be anticipated, and to a greater or less extent have been secured.

I cannot help believing that such results as these would justify any movement, and I am sure that the many obstacles which now appear to beset its path will in some way be overcome, and that in time its full possibilities will be realized.

## THE CONFERENCE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

NOTT W. FLINT  
The University of Chicago

The English Conference, to be of the greatest value to teachers of English, should discuss those questions which the greatest number of teachers are thinking about. According with this conviction the 1905 conference was planned. The English Department of the University sent out to various teachers one hundred letters, asking them to submit any question they thought the conference ought to discuss. The sixty answers to these letters brought in forty-five distinct questions. These were read at the conference this year, but space forbids their insertion here. They classify, however, as follows:

A. The English curriculum or course of study	-	-	-	-	-	22
B. Literature:						
1. History of literature	-	-	-	-	-	2
2. The teaching of general literature and of specific classics				-	-	5
3. American literature	-	-	-	-	-	2
C. Rhetoric:						
1. Formal matters (grammar, spelling, punctuation, etc.)	-	-	-	-	-	2
2. Composition	-	-	-	-	-	12

NOTE.—The twenty-two questions on the curriculum for the most part pointed in two directions: (1) What is the present value for secondary schools of the “required” classics? and, (2) What is the best way of arranging or distributing the work through the four years?

In view of these questions, the conference for this year decided that in 1905 it would choose, as the subjects for discussion, (1) “The English Curriculum,” and (2) “Some Matters of Composition” (to be determined later). To bring the matter of the curriculum fairly before the conference, a volunteer committee of five was asked for. The five who offered for the committee are: Mr. G. W. Tanner, Northwest Division High School, Chicago; Miss Frances N. Symmes, Kenwood Institute, Chicago; Miss Ferrell, High School, Oak Park,